

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

ROBERT DENNIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**HEAD WARDEN WILLIAMS, et al.,
Defendants.**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

3:15-CV-2535-D-BK

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)](#) and *Special Order 3*, this case was automatically referred to the United States Magistrate Judge. Plaintiff, a county inmate, filed a *pro se* complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. For the reasons that follow, this action should be dismissed for want of prosecution.

I. BACKGROUND

On July 31, 2015, Plaintiff filed this action against Johnson County Warden Williams, Assistant Warden Johnson, an unidentified medical subcontractor, and Doctor Wuster Hauzen. After docketing and filing the complaint, the Court mailed to Plaintiff the New Case Notes and Notice and Instruction to Pro Se Party. On August 13, 2015, however, both documents were returned to the Court because he was no longer confined at the Johnson County Jail. [Doc. 4](#). Plaintiff has not apprised the Court of his new address.

II. ANALYSIS

[Rule 41\(b\) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure](#) allows a court to dismiss an action *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or for failure to comply with the federal rules or any court order. [Larson v. Scott, 157 F.3d 1030, 1031 \(5th Cir. 1998\)](#). “This authority flows from the court’s inherent power to control its docket and prevent undue delays in the disposition of pending


cases.” [Boudwin v. Graystone Ins. Co., Ltd., 756 F.2d 399, 401 \(5th Cir. 1985\)](#) (citing [Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626 \(1962\)](#)).

Plaintiff’s whereabouts are presently unknown. The Court is not required to delay disposition in this case until such time as Plaintiff provides a current address. Therefore, this action should be dismissed without prejudice for lack of prosecution. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b) (an involuntary dismissal “operates as an adjudication on the merits,” unless otherwise specified).

III. RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, it is recommended that this action be **DISMISSED** without prejudice for want of prosecution.


SIGNED August 31, 2015.



RENEE HARRIS TOLIVER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT

A copy of this report and recommendation will be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#); [FED. R. CIV. P. 72\(b\)](#). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See* [Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass’n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 \(5th Cir. 1996\)](#).



RENEE HARRIS TOLIVER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE